

No. 3992-3Lab-78/1805.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Electronics Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 36 of 1978

between

SHRI MOHAN RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ELECTRONICS
LTD., FARIDABAD

Present—

None for the workman.

Shri Mulkh Raj, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/454-77/6440, dated 10th February, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Electronics Ltd., Faridabad and its workman Shri Mohan Ram, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Mohan Ram was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. Notices have been served on both the parties. The management appeared but neither the workman nor his representative appeared. None appeared for the workman. The workman defaulted in appearance. It seems that the workman is not taking any interest in his dispute. I, therefore, give my award that the termination of services of Shri Mohan Ram was justified and in order. He is not entitled to any relief. However, this award is not on merits.

Dated the 30th March, 1978.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

— — — — —
No. 285, dated the 31st March, 1978

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 31st March, 1978.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 3991-3Lab-78/1807.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Sirecco Auto Pvt. Ltd., Sector 6, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 38 of 1978

between

SHRI ABDUL BASHEER, WORKMAN AND M/S SIRECCO AUTO PRIVATE LTD, SECTOR-6,
FARIDABAD

Present—

Shri H. S. Gill, for the workman.

Shri Anand Sarup, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/615-77/4098, dated 2nd February, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Sirecco Aut. Private Ltd., Sector-6, Faridabad and its workman Shri Abdul Basheer, to this Tribunal for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Abdul Basheer was justified ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared but on the date fixed the representative for the workman stated that the workman had received all his dues and they settled his dispute fully and finally and had left for good. He wanted to withdraw the dispute. He was allowed to withdraw the dispute. I, therefore, give my award as follows:—

That the termination of services of the workman concerned Shri Abdul Basheer was justified and in order. He is not entitled to any relief. As per the statement of his representative he has settled his dispute with the management fully and finally.

Dated the 30th March, 1978.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 284, dated the 31st March, 1978

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 31st March, 1978.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 3993-3Lab-78/1809.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Lal Dee Pvt. Ltd., Faridabad.

**BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER,
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

Reference No. 213 of 1977

between

**SHRI MAHI LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S LAL
DEE PRIVATE LIMITED, FARIDABAD**

Present—

Shri Roshan Lal Sharma, for the workman.
Shri R.C. Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/427-77/49102, dated 22nd November, 1977, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Lal Dee Private Ltd., Faridabad and its workman Shri Mahi Lal, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Mahi Lal was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. In the written statement, the management pleaded that they had not terminated the services of the workman concerned and the name of the workman concerned is still borne on their muster roll and that the workman concerned can report for duty any time. The workman was still their employee.

In view of this pleading of the management the reference became infructuous as the services of the workman concerned has not been terminated. The reference is a premature one. I, therefore, give my award as follows :—

That the services of the workman concerned has not been terminated, hence justifiability of termination of services is out of question. The workman concerned can report for duty to the management at any time he likes.

Dated the 30th March, 1978. !

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 286, dated the 31st March, 1978

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 31st March, 1978.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 3994-3Lab-78/1811.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s U. Kay Builders Pvt. Ltd., Mathura Road, Ballabgarh.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 11 of 1978

between

SHRI SHRI CHAND, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S U.
KAY BUILDERS PRIVATE LIMITED, MATHURA ROAD, BALLABGARH

Present—

Shri Hari Singh Yadav, for the workman.

Nemo for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/1395, dated 13th January, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following disputes between the management of M/s U. Kay Builders Private Limited, Mathura Road, Ballabagarh and its workman Shri Shri Chand to this Tribunal, for adjudication

in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Shri Chand was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. Both the parties have been served with notice. The workman appeared but the management did not appear. *Ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the management and the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the workman. The workman examined himself as his own witness who stated that the management terminated his services illegally without any fault, without charge-sheeting the workman concerned. I believe in the statement of the workman. I, therefore, give my award as follows :—

That the termination of services of the workman concerned was neither justified nor in order. He is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and with full back wages.

NATHU RAM SHARMA

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated the 30th March, 1978.

No. 299, dated the 31st March, 1978

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated the 31st March, 1978.

The 10th April, 1978

No. 3917-3Lab-78/1768.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Sikand Ltd., 61, NIT, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR
COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 31 of 1977

between

SHRI RAGHUBUR SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF
M/S SIKAND LTD., 61, NIT, FARIDABAD

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/225-77/21946, dated 4th June, 1977, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Sikand Ltd., 61, NIT, Faridabad and its workman Shri Raghubir Singh to this Court for adjudication in exercise

of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Raghubir Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The parties put in their appearance in this Court in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them and filed their pleadings.

The workman concerned alleged,—*vide* claim statement filed by him in conformity with the notice of demand served by him on the management that the latter illegally terminated his services on 10th January, 1977 at about 3-00 p.m. without serving any charge-sheet on him and without assigning any reasons, in order to victimise him for his trade union activities. He stated that he was employed with the management concerned as a Sweeper on wages of Rs. 170 p.m., since 1973 and that he was an active member of the union and that he was sent out of the factory on 10th January, 1977 at about 3-00 p.m. by the management with a gate pass given to him by them and that he came to know on 27th January, 1977 from their letter that they were showing him as absent from duty in their records. He gave out that he reported himself to the management concerned for assignment of duties on 28th January, 1977 but the latter declined to take him on duty.

The management concerned denied the allegations of the workman that they had terminated his services in the manner stated by him on 10th January, 1977 at 3-00 p.m. and pleaded,—*vide* written statement filed by them that they wanted to serve him with a charge-sheet on 10th January, 1977 with the allegations that he refused to clean the shop floor on an order made by the Production Director Shri Krishan Sikand on that date and that he refused to receive the charge-sheet and that on his desiring to go out of the factory he was given a gate pass. They denied the allegations that he reported himself for assignment of duties either on 11th January, 1977 or on 28th January, 1977 and averred that he continued to be still under suspension pending an enquiry against him.

The workman reiterated the allegations made by him in the claim statement and controverted the pleas of the management,—*vide* rejoinder filed by him with the result that the following issues were framed,—*vide* my order dated 10th August, 1977 :—

1. Whether the services of the workman were ever terminated by the management concerned ?
2. If yes, whether the termination of services of the workman by the management was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

I have heard learned authorised representatives of the parties with reference to the evidence led by them. I decide the issue as under :—

Issue No. 1 :

This is an important issue in the case. It would appear from the pleas of the parties stated in detail above, that whereas the workman alleged that he was sent out of the factory on 10th January, 1977 at about 3-00 p.m. by the management concerned and not allowed to enter therein thereafter, the management consistently pleaded that he was put under suspension pending an enquiry and that he had refused to receive the chargesheet and failed to report for duty. I am thus called upon to determine and find out the plea established on record. The workman examined one Shri Manjeet Singh a co-workman as WW-1 besides himself appearing as his own witness. Shri Manjeet Singh made an oral statement that Shri Raghubir Singh workman concerned had told him on 10th January, 1977 at about 4-30 p.m. outside the factory

that he had been asked by the management concerned to leave the factory premises with the gate pass given to him by them for that purpose and that he found him (Raghubir Singh) outside the factory on 11th January, 1977 at about 8-00 a.m. and saw the Security Officer shutting his entry inside the factory. He admitted that he had been suspended on 11th January, 1977 and that he saw the workman concerned outside the factory every day for about one and quarter months after 11th January, 1977.

The workman concerned fully corroborated his case while appearing as his own witness and deposed that he sent letter copy Ex. W-1 to the management concerned through registered post and that on his receiving a letter Ex. W-3 from the management along with the chargesheet W-4, on 27th January, 1977, in respect of his refusal to obey the orders of Shri Krishan Sikand to sweep the floor, he served the management with a notice of demand copy E. W-5. He added that on his going to the factory on 28th January, 1977 for joining duties after receipt of the letter E. W-3 showing him absent from duty since 10th January, 1977, the management declined to take him on duty.

The management examined Shri M.L. Narula their Factory Manager who deposed that the workman concerned was found marked as absent from 10th January, 1977 onwards in the register of attendance brought by him in court of suspended employees maintained at the security gate and that his entry in the factory was never shut and there was no restriction on his entry inside the factory.

I have fully considered the evidence documentary and oral led by the parties. It is conceded on both sides that the management have kept alive the chargesheet, dated 10th January, 1977 copy Ex. W-4 served on the management with the allegations that he refused to obey the orders of Shri Krishan Sikand Production Director of cleaning the floor and that they did not initiate any enquiry till date. What led to the management in sitting silent over such a serious charge for such a long period is not really understandable. If the workman concerned in fact refused to receive the chargesheet tendered to him for service they could have easily proceeded against him *ex parte* and awarded him punishment for the misconduct if established against him as a result of the enquiry. Their keeping silent over such a serious matter for such a long period in absence of any explanation by them leads to a conclusion beyond doubt that the story put forth by them is false and fabricated and that they adopted the pleas taken up by them,—*vide* their written statement only as a device to to meet the case of the workman concerned.

The management admitted the receipt of letter, dated 28th January, 1977 Ex. M-1 from the workman intimating them the denial of the charges levelled against him giving in detail the story put now put forth by him. Even though Shri M.L. Narula, Factory Manager deposed that the management sent the reply of the letter Ex. M-1 to the workman yet he could not substantiate his statement with reference to any document and a copy of the reply retained by them. He admitted that the management did not send any reply of the notice of demand Ex. W-5 received by them to the workman. All these facts lead to a conclusion beyond doubt that whereas the workman concerned had been crying hoarse against the illegal termination of his services by the management verbally on 10th January, 1977 from the very beginning, the management kept silent over the matter till 21st January, 1977 when they intimated him the charges for the first time in writing. The management could not explain as to why did they not intimate the absence of the workman to him from 10th January, 1977 onwards and the factum of his suspension in writing if the story put forth by them was correct. Their failure to do so again leads to a conclusion already arrived at by me that whereas the case put forth by the workman is correct and has been well established, the pleas put forth by the management are false and fabricated.

I, thus relying on the statement of Shri Raghbir Singh workman and his witness Shri Manjeet Singh and disbelieving the statement of Shri M.L. Narula and the pleas put forth by the management decide this issue against the management.

Issue No. 2 :

In view of my findings on issue No. 1, I hold that the termination of services of the workman by the management is unjustified and that he is entitled to be reinstated with effect from 11th January, 1977 with continuity of service and full back wages. I decide this issue accordingly and answer the reference while returning the award in these terms.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Dated 24th March, 1978.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 854, dated 31st March, 1978.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

G. V. GUPTA, Secy.

EXCISE AND TAXATION DEPARTMENT

The 17th April, 1978

No. 1985-ET(I)-78/10951.— The result of the Departmental Examination of the Officers of the Excise and Taxation Department, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh, held in February, 1978 is announced as under:—

Serial No.	Name of the officer/ official and District in which posted.	Paper I (Law of Crimes)	Paper II (Excise Law)	Paper III (Allied Taxes)	Paper IV (Property Tax Law)	Paper V (Sales Tax Law)	Paper VI (Book Keeping)	Paper VII (Landa Script)	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Excise and Taxation Officers									
S/Shri									
1	Bhim Singh Denodia, Hissar	Pass	Fail	Fail	Fail	..	
2	Ramesh Chander, Bahadurgarh	..	Fail	Pass	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3	Dharam Pal Sirohi, Ambala Cantt.	..	Fail	Pass	Fail	Fail	
4	Suraj Bhan Khangwal, Narnaul	..	Fail	
5	Charan Singh, Rewari	Pass	Fail	Fail	Fail	..	
6	Miss Mukesh Lata, Jind	Pass (WC)	Fail	..	Pass	Fail	
7	Karan Singh, Sonapat	Pass	..	Fail	Pass (WC)	Fail	
8	Dev Kumar Airon, Charkhi Dadri	..	Fail	
9	Ramotar Sharma, Faridabad	..	Fail	..	Pass (WC)	..	Pass (WC)	..	
10	Subhash Kumar (UT), Faridabad	..	Fail	Pass	Pass (WC)	Fail	

Assistant Excise and Taxation Officers

S/Shri

11	B. S. Malik, Hissar	..	Pass	Pass	
12	Sukhbir Singh, Hissar	..	Fail	
13	Ashok Kumar (UT), Hissar	..	Fail	Pass	..	Fail	
14	Jai Dev Naharwal, Hissar	..	Fail	Fail	..	
15	Dhan Singh STCB, Tohana	..	Fail	Fail	..	Fail	
16	Gurkirpal Singh STCB, Bahadurgarh	..	Fail	..	Pass (WC)	Fail	
17	Chander Dev Gaur STCB, Cheeka	Pass	Fail	
18	Azad Singh, Gurgaon	Pass	..	Fail	..	
19	Krishan Lal Dua STCB, Doondahera (Gurgaon)	Fail	..	Fail	Fail	..	
20	Munish Kumar Dutta STCB, Hodal	..	Fail	Fail	
21	Shiv Narain Sharma, Gurgaon	..	Fail	Pass	
22	Mrs. Urmila Devi (UT), Karnal	Pass (WC)	Fail	..	Pass	Fail	Pass	..	
23	Ram Kishan Thindwal (UT), Karnal	..	Fail	Fail	Pass	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	S/Shri								
24	Mahadev Parshad Mittal (UT) Karnal	..	Fail	Fail	Pass (WC)	Fail	
25	R. S. Burman, Ambala Cantt.	..	Fail	
26	B. R. Sanwaria (UT), Ambala Cantt	Pass	..	Fail	Pass	Fail	Fail	..	
27	Yashvir Singh, Chauhan STCB, Yamuna Nagar	..	Fail	Pass	
28	Mewa Singh STCB, Yamunanagar	..	Fail	Pass	..	Fail	
29	Kapuri Lal Gupta, STCB, Yamunanagar	Fail	..	
30	Ramesh Kumar Sharma STCB, Ambala City	Pass	..	
31	Mohinder Singh Pawaar, Ambala City	Fail	..	
32	Ram Kumar Sharma STCB, Ambala City	Pass	Fail	Fail	
33	Wadhawa Ram Katyal STCB, Ambala City	..	Fail	Pass	
34	Satish Kumar Mittal (UT), Narnaul	..	Fail	Fail	
35	Yudhvir Singh Dhariwal (UT), Narnaul	Fail	Fail	Fail	Pass (WC)	Fail	Pass	..	
36	Nafe Singh Dhankar STCB, Khandora	..	Fail	
37	Balbir Singh, Narwana	..	Fail	Fail	
38	M. N. Nagyal, Jind	..	Fail	Pass	
39	Mahabir Singh (UT), Jind	Fail	..	Pass	Pass	Fail	Fail	..	
40	Dharam Pal Singh STCB, Saidpur (Sonepat)	Pass	Fail	Pass	Pass	Fail	Fail	..	
41	A.L. Bajaj, Charkhi Dadri	Pass	
42	H.C. Gargi, Kurukshetra	Pass(WC)	..	
43	Amar Singh Clare, Shahabad	..	Fail	
44	A. N. Kummi, Dabwali	..	Fail	
45	Dhani Ram STCB, Dabwali	..	Fail	Fail	..	Fail	
46	Balbir Singh Boora STCB, Dabwali	..	Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass(WC)	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
S/Shri									
47	Inderjit Sinha, Faridabad	Pass	..	Pass
48	Ved Parkash Chadha, Faridabad	Fail	Pass
49	O.P. Uttam, Faridabad	Fail	Fail
50	Hamir Singh, Faridabad	Fail
51	Paras Nath Mittal STCB, Faridabad	Fail	Pass	Pass(WC)	Fail	Fail
52	Mohindar Kumar Kalia, Faridabad	Fail	Fail	Fail
53	Lok Nath Gambhir, Headquarter (Chandigarh)	Fail	Pass
54	Mrs. Shakti Malhotra Headquarter, Chandigarh	Fail
55	Vijay Kumar Rohilla STCB, Ambala City	Fail	Fail
56	Lall Chand Chaudhary STCB, Hodal	Fail
57	Gaje Singh STCB, Hodal	Pass(WC)	Fail
58	Mahabir Singh Hooda STCB, Dabwali	Fail	Pass
Taxation Inspectors, Ambala									
59	Kaur Singh STCB, Zirakpur	Pass
60	Ved Parkash Sharma, Jagadhri	Fail	Pass
61	Charanjit Lal STCB, Ambala City ..	Pass	Fail
62	Suresh Chander Gupta, Ambala Cantt. ..	Pass	Fail
63	Madan Lal Malhotra STCB, Barwala ..	Fail	..	Fail	Pass	Fail
64	Harcharan Singh STCB, Kalka	Fail	Fail
65	Baldev Singh Mann, Ambala City ..	Fail	Fail	Fail
66	Jagdish Singh, Ambala Cant.	Pass (HS)
HISSAR									
67	Jai Parkash STCB, Hospur	Fail
68	Manohar Lal Tuteja STCB, Balsamand	Fail	Fail	Fail

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
SIRSA									
69	Ram Kishan Kalanwali	STCB,	Pass	Pass	Fail
SONEPAT									
70	Birinder Raj Sonepat	Bhatia,	Fail	..	Pass	Fail	..
GURGAON									
71	Partap Singh STCB, Mundka	Roghovo	Fail	Pass	Fail
FARIDABAD									
72	Bishamber Faridabad	Dayal,	Fail	..	Fail	Pass	..	Fail	..
73	Ram Chander STCB, Faridabad	Gupta,	Pass	Fail	..
74	Chander Mohan Anand, Faridabad		Pass	Fail
75	Sukh Ram STCB, Suraj Kund		Fail
ROHTAK									
76	Rahul Rajyana, Rohtak		Pass (H.S.)
77	Mahipal Singh Bahadurgarh	STCB,	Fail	..	Fail	Pass	Fail
MAHENDARGARH									
78	Dharam Paul, Rewari		Fail	Fail	..
CHANDIGARH (H.Q.)									
79	Om Parkash Garg /		Pass (HS)	Pass (WC)	Fail
EXCISE INSPECTORS									
80	Om Parkash Punia, Panipat		Pass	Fail	Fail
81	Bhim Singh, Gurgaon		Fail
82	Ram Kumar Arora		..	Fail	Fail
EXCISE AND TAXATION INSPECTORS (HIMACHAL PRADESH)									
83	Krishan Mohan Singh Baroti Barrier (Solan)		Fail	..	Fail
84	Kuldip Kumar Thakur, Solan		..	Fail	Pass	Pass(HS)
85	Dhyan Singh Shandal, Solan		Pass	Pass(HS)	Pass (HS)
86	Rajpal Singh Parwanu (Solan)		..	Fail	Fail	Pass	Pass

(Sd.) . . .
Deputy Secretary, Excise and Taxation
for Financial Commissioner, Revenue and
Secretary to Government, Haryana,
Excise and Taxation Department.